

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 139-167, 190, 192-198, 203-205, 277-278, 280-284, 286-289, 291 and 293-295. Claims 285 and 290 were cancelled because their subject matter was incorporated into parent claims. Claims 296-299 were cancelled as they depend on cancelled claims. Claims 196 and 198 were amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 139, 154, 283, 288 and 293 were amended, following the interview with the Examiner.

Interview summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview of March 8, 2007 between the Examiner and applicant's agent, Yaakov Schatz. In the interview, the differences between using an RF carrier and an acoustic carrier were discussed including the advantages of using acoustic carriers, which may include use of existing hardware to receive the transmissions, low power consumption and easy control of the transmission range. Hartkorn (U.S. patent 3,961,323) was discussed and applicant's agent explained that the audio frequency (col. 5, line 40) modulates the RF carrier frequency and Hartkon does not use an acoustic carrier.

The Examiner requested amendment of "which information" to "wherein said information", and addition of the requirement that the carrier is an acoustic carrier in claims that did not include this requirement. The Examiner stated that this amendment would overcome the art of record.

Response to rejections

For completeness of the response, applicants are providing in short arguments regarding the rejections of the claims.

Claims 139, 142-143, 145-150, 157-161 and 166-167 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carroll et al. (U.S. patent 5,517,194).

Claims 139-141, 143-144, 162-165, 283-291 and 293-295 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Yokota et al. (U.S. patent 5,914,980) in view of Hartkorn (U.S. patent 3,961,323).

Claims 139, 150-156 and 280-282 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Gunnarsson (U.S. patent 5,552,790) in view of Hartkorn (U.S. patent 3,961,323).

Claim 277 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunnarsson (U.S. patent 5,552,790) in view of Rodal et al. (U.S. patent 5,467,095).

Claim 278 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunnarsson (U.S. patent 5,552,790) in view of Cole et al. (U.S. patent 5,523,749).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* rejection.

Claim 139 requires a low frequency circuit, adapted to handle transmission or reception of information on an acoustic carrier.

This is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. As acknowledged by the Examiner (paragraphs 8 and 9 of the office action), Yokota and Gunnarsson do not teach an acoustic carrier. Applicants respectfully submit that Carroll also does not teach or suggest an acoustic carrier and only relates to an RF transponder (abstract). The Examiner has not stated otherwise, as in the rejection based on Carroll (page 4 of the office action), the Examiner has made no mention of an acoustic carrier.

Regarding Hartkorn, applicants respectfully note that Hartkorn does not teach or suggest an acoustic carrier. Fig. 2 of Hartkorn clearly shows a 27 MHz RF oscillator and loop antenna 16 is clearly an RF antenna. The audio frequency from about 2-20 kHz (col. 5, lines 41-43) related to by the Examiner is the information that the transmitter 8 modulates on the RF carrier.

Thus, none of the cited references relates to a smart card transmitting information on an acoustic carrier, as required by claim 139.

The other dependent claims were amended to require an acoustic carrier and are patentable, at least, for the reasons discussed above.

The dependent claims are patentable at least by virtue of their parent claims.

Withdrawn claims

Applicants respectfully request that the withdrawn claims 190, 192-198 and 203-205, which depend on other independent claims, be allowed along with the parent claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully notes that US patent 6661563 to Hayashi et al., that the Examiner cited as of interest, has an earliest priority of January 31, 2000, while the present application was filed in the PCT on October 4, 1999. Therefore, Hayashi is irrelevant.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

11

In view of the above remarks, applicants submit that the claims are patentable over the prior art. Allowance of the application is respectfully awaited. If, however, the Examiner is not convinced and the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conversation may forward the present application toward allowance, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned at 1 (877) 428-5468. Please note that this is a direct *toll free* number in the US that is answered in the undersigned's Israel office. Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington.

Respectfully submitted,

Yaakov Schatz
Yaakov Schatz
Reg. No. 44,320

March 14, 2007

Encl:

Petition for Extension for one (1) month time

BEST AVAILABLE COPY